

1      Samuel Castor (11532)  
2      Anne-Marie Birk (12330)  
3      SWITCH, LTD.  
4      7135 South Decatur Blvd.  
5      Las Vegas, Nevada 89118  
4      Telephone: (702) 444-4111  
5      sam@switch.com  
5      abirk@switch.com

6 Mark A. Hutchison (4639)  
7 Jacob A. Reynolds (10199)  
8 Piers R. Tueller (14633)  
HUTCHISON & STEFFEN, PLLC  
9 Peccole Professional Park  
10 10080 West Alta Drive, Suite 200  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89145  
11 Telephone: (702) 385-2500  
Fax: (702) 385-2086  
12 mhutchison@hutchlegal.com  
jreynolds@hutchlegal.com  
ptueller@hutchlegal.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

17 SWITCH, LTD., a Nevada limited liability  
company,

CASE NO. 2:17-cv-02651-GMN-EJY

18 Plaintiff,

VS.

21 STEPHEN FAIRFAX; MTECHNOLOGY; and  
22 DOES 1 through 10; ROE ENTITIES 11 through  
20, inclusive.

**STIPULATED AMENDED  
DISCOVERY PLAN AND  
SCHEDULING ORDER**

**(THIRD REQUEST)**

23 Defendants.

Pursuant to LR IA 6-1 and LR 26-4, counsel for Plaintiff SWITCH, LTD. (“Plaintiff”) and Defendants STEPHEN FAIRFAX and MTECHNOLOGY (“Defendants”) hereby submit this Stipulated Amended Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order to extend the current discovery deadlines.

1       The parties make this third request for continuance in good faith after resolving the  
 2 motions and various filings that have not yet been resolved by the Court. In short, this case  
 3 involves substantial trade secrets that both parties would like to protect. No protective order has  
 4 been entered which has resulted in extremely limited document production, which further  
 5 prevents meaningful depositions and complete expert reports from being prepared and  
 6 submitted.

7       Accordingly, to resolve the discovery impasse the parties are contemporaneously filing a  
 8 stipulated protective order which will allow the parties to begin meaningful production of  
 9 documents, depositions, and expert work. Given the impending holidays and other demands on  
 10 counsel, the parties have agreed to the following extension to prevent further delays in the case  
 11 and bring a resolution to the case.

12       In support of this Stipulation, the parties state as follows:

13 **1. Discovery Completed to Date**

14       The parties have served written discovery on each other. However, in the responses that  
 15 have been served, both parties have objected to many of the requests on the grounds that there is  
 16 no protective order in this case.

17       The parties have attempted over many months and multiple meet and confers to resolve  
 18 this issue, including filing a Request for a Pretrial Conference and Submission of Proposed  
 19 Protective Order<sup>1</sup> and Motion to Extend Deadlines for Disclosure of Experts and Expert  
 20 Reports.<sup>2</sup> These filings are resolved by the contemporaneous stipulated protective order and this  
 21 discovery plan, and should therefore be denied as moot.

22       Defendants served an initial expert report, and Plaintiff served a rebuttal expert report.  
 23 Both were hampered by the lack of document production in this case.

24 **2. Discovery Remaining to be Completed**

25       The parties have reached an agreement regarding a stipulated protective order, which  
 26 will be filed with the Court contemporaneously with this Stipulation.

27       There has been no document production in this case, but the parties have agreed to a  
 28 date certain to respond to the pending discovery requests once the protective order is entered.

---

<sup>1</sup> (Dkt. No. 48).

<sup>2</sup> (Dkt. No. 55).

1 Depositions of the parties, and experts need to be set, as well as potential site visits.

2 **3. Reasons why Discovery has not been Completed**

3 Good cause exists to extend the discovery deadlines in this case. Good cause to extend a  
 4 discovery deadline exists if it cannot reasonably be met despite the diligence of the party  
 5 seeking the extension.”<sup>3</sup>

6 It became clear after the first discovery responses in June of 2019 that both parties  
 7 would require a protective order to fully engage in discovery. Through July and August 2019,  
 8 the parties engaged in several email and telephonic discussions in an attempt to form an  
 9 acceptable protective order. Ultimately, Defendants filed their Request for Pretrial Conference  
 10 and Proposed Protective Order on September 3, 2019, stating that, “given the number of times  
 11 and the length of time that the parties debated this issue, it was clear that it was time for outside  
 12 help.”<sup>4</sup>

13 The lack of a protective order has caused several issues in this case. It has prevented  
 14 both sides from fully engaging in the discovery process, including document production. The  
 15 parties cannot depose any potential witnesses without the proper documentation. However, the  
 16 parties have reached an agreement regarding a stipulated protective order that will now allow  
 17 discovery to proceed in full. The parties do not anticipate requesting any additional extensions  
 18 of the discovery period.

19 The parties hereby stipulate to move the discovery deadlines in this case, including the  
 20 deadlines for initial and rebuttal expert disclosures, which have passed.<sup>5</sup> Under LR 26-4, “A  
 21 request made after the expiration of the subject deadline will not be granted unless the movant  
 22 also demonstrates that the failure to act was the result of excusable neglect.” Though this  
 23 Stipulation is filed after the expiration of the expert deadlines, the parties have already taken  
 24 other timely steps to address these deadlines. Defendants submitted an initial expert report.  
 25 Plaintiff previously filed a Motion to Extend Deadlines for Disclosure of Experts and Expert  
 26 Reports<sup>6</sup> explaining that the lack of a protective order made it impossible for Plaintiff to prepare

---

27 <sup>3</sup> *Derosa v. Blood Sys., Inc.*, No. 2:13-CV-0137-JCM-NJK, 2013 WL 3975764, at \*1 (D. Nev. Aug. 1, 2013)  
 28 (internal citations omitted).

<sup>4</sup> Defendants’ Request for Pretrial Conference and Proposed Protective Order (Dkt. No. 48 at 4).

<sup>5</sup> Stipulated Amended Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order (Dkt. No. 45).

<sup>6</sup> (Dkt. No. 55).

1 an initial expert report. Plaintiff was able to submit a rebuttal expert report, though it was  
 2 hampered by the lack of document production in this case.

3 **4. Proposed Schedule for Completing all Remaining Discovery**

Scheduled Event	Current Deadline	Proposed Deadline
Discovery Cut-Off	December 9, 2019 <sup>7</sup>	April 30, 2020
Initial Expert Disclosures	October 10, 2019	June 1, 2020
Rebuttal Expert Disclosures	November 8, 2019	July 1, 2020
Dispositive Motions	January 8, 2020	July 31, 2020
Pretrial Order	February 7, 2020	August 31, 2020—this deadline is suspended if a dispositive motion is timely filed

12 The parties further agree that all discovery requests currently pending must be responded  
 13 to by December 20, 2019.

14 It is so stipulated.

15 DATED this \_\_\_\_th day of November, 2019.

16 HUTCHISON & STEFFEN, PLLC

17 /s/ Jacob A. Reynolds

18 Mark A. Hutchison (4639)

19 Jacob A. Reynolds (10199)

20 Piers R. Tueller (14633)

21 **HUTCHISON & STEFFEN, PLLC**

22 Peccole Professional Park

23 10080 West Alta Drive, Suite 200

24 Las Vegas, NV 89145

25 Samuel Castor (11532)

26 Anne-Marie Birk (12330)

27 SWITCH, LTD.

28 7135 South Decatur Blvd.

Las Vegas, Nevada 89118

/s/ Ronald D. Green

Ronald D. Green (NV Bar No. 7360)

Alex J. Shepard (NV Bar No. 13582)

**RANDAZZA LEGAL GROUP, PLLC**

2764 Lake Sahara Drive, Suite 109

28 Las Vegas, NV 89117

26 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

27 *Attorneys for Defendants*

28 <sup>7</sup> “Any stipulation or motion must be made no later than November 18, 2019.” (Dkt. No. 45 at 3).

1 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the scheduling in this case will proceed as follows:  
2 Discovery Cut-Off April 30, 2020  
3 Initial Expert Disclosures June 1, 2020  
4 Rebuttal Expert Disclosures July 1, 2020  
5 Dispositive Motions July 31, 2020  
6 Pretrial Order August 31, 2020—this deadline is  
7 suspended if a dispositive motion is timely  
8 filed

9  
10 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendants' Request for a Pretrial Conference and  
11 Submission of Proposed Protective Order (Dkt. No. 48) is DENIED AS MOOT.

12 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion to Extend Deadlines for Disclosure  
13 of Experts and Expert Reports (Dkt. No. 55) is DENIED AS MOOT.

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19 U.S. Magistrate Judge

20  
21 Dated: \_\_\_\_\_  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 18<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2019, the foregoing document entitled: **STIPULATED AMENDED DISCOVERY PLAN AND SCHEDULING ORDER (THIRD REQUEST)** was served via electronic service through the United States District Court for the District of Nevada's ECF System upon each party in the case who is registered as an electronic case filing user with the Clerk.

/s/ Suzanne Morehead  
An employee of Hutchison & Steffen, PLLC